REMARKS

Claims 1-56 were presented for examination. In an Office Action dated January 7, 2009, claims 1-56 were rejected. In response, claims 1, 6,10, 13, 22, 27, 32, 36, 39, 48, and 53 are amended, claims 5, 25-26, 31, and 51-52 are cancelled, and claims 57-62 are added herein. In view of the Amendments herein and the Remarks that follow, reconsideration of all outstanding objections and rejections, and withdrawal of them, is now requested.

Response to Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-6, 10-32, 36-52 and 54-56 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ryan, U.S. Patent No. 6,421,675, in view of Knight, U.S. Patent No. 6,571,234, and further in view of Dumais, U.S. Patent No. 7,162,473. Claims 6 and 32 stand rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over Ryan, Knight, Dumais, and further in view of Logan, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0093790. Claims 7-9, 33-35, and 53 stand rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over Ryan, Knight, Dumais and further in view of Zhou, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0059730. This rejection is traversed in view of the amended claims.

Claims 1 and 27 respectively recite a method and a computer-readable storage medium for ranking article identifiers of a result set from an implicit query implied from a user's current context. Claim 1 is representative.

> A method of ranking article identifiers of a result set from an implicit query implied from a user's current context, the method comprising:
>> receiving an event concerning the user's current context, wherein the event comprises a user interaction with an article having content stored on a local client device, wherein the article is associated with at least one of a plurality of client applications;
>> analyzing the content of the article associated with the event concerning the user's current context to extract at least one keyword;

generating an implicit query based at least in part on the at least one
keyword;
performing a search based at least in part on the implicit query to
determine a result set, wherein the result set comprises one or more
article identifiers associated with articles relevant to the implicit
query; and
ranking the article identifiers based at least in part on one or more
characteristics of the content of the article associated with the
event concerning the user's current context, wherein the one or
more characteristics comprise highlighting of the content of the
article associated with the event.

The claimed invention receives an event concerning the user's current context,
wherein the event comprises a user interaction with an article having content stored on a
local device. The content of the article associated with the event is analyzed to extract at
least one keyword. Analyzing the content of the article associated with the event to extract at
least one keyword allows an implicit search query to be generated based at least in part on
the keyword resulting in a result set that comprises article identifiers relevant to the user at
that particular time without the user having to explicitly enter a search query. The article
identifiers are ranked based at least in part on one or more characteristics of the content of
the article associated with the event concerning the user's current context. The one or more
characteristics comprise highlighting of the content of the article associated with the event.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate limitations similar to those previously
recited in claim 6. As noted by the Examiner, Ryan, Knight, and Dumais fail to disclose or
suggest ranking article identifiers based at least in part on characteristics of the content of the
article, wherein the characteristics comprise metadata associated with the article, the
metadata comprising at least one of bolding, highlighting, italicizing, font color, or heading
data of content within the article. *See* Office Action, pg. 13. Thus, Ryan, Knight, and
Dumais similarly fail to disclose or suggest "ranking article identifiers based at least in part

on one or more characteristics of the content of the article associated with the event

concerning the user's current context, wherein the one or more characteristics comprise

highlighting of the content of the article associated with the event," as currently recited in

amended claim 1. Logan does not remedy the deficiencies of Ryan, Knight, and Dumais.

Logan discloses a system for utilizing metadata to enhance a user's enjoyment of

available broadcast programming content. *See* Logan, Abstract. Logan discloses that an

electronic program guide is available to the user and that the guide displays a listing of

available programming. *See* Logan, ¶ [0260]. The user may select items from the

programming guide to record or play incoming broadcasts, play previously recorded

programming, or may identify future programming for recording. *See* Logan, ¶ [0260].

Logan discloses using metadata to assist a user in locating desirable programming in order to

enhance the content and operation of the programming guide. *See* Logan, ¶ [0264].

As noted by the Examiner, metadata indicating a user's preferences may be used to

selectively display and highlight particular programs in the program guide listing. *See*

Logan, ¶ [0264]. Logan discloses that "highlighting may be used to *identify* listed programs

and segments for which additional metadata is available for display to the user" and that

"[m]etadata which ranks programs may be *displayed* using rating icons, color coding, or

highlighting to guide the viewer toward higher rated programs" *See* Logan, ¶ [0264]. Thus,

Logan utilizes highlighting merely as a *visual indicator* to direct users toward higher rated

programs according to their preferences. While Logan does rank programs based on

metadata, there is no hint, mention, or disclosure in Logan that the ranking of programs is

based at least in part on one or more characteristics of the content of an article associated

with the event concerning the user's current context, where the one or more characteristics

comprise "**highlighting** of the **content of the article associated with the event**," as claimed. Rather, at best Logan merely ranks the programs based on user preferences indicated in a user profile. *See* Logan, ¶¶ [0021] and [0264].

Therefore, for at least these reasons, the cited references both alone and in combination fail to show all of the claimed elements and thus the Examiner has not met his burden in establishing a prima facie case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Claims 1 and 27 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Amended claim 53 includes limitations similar to those of claim 1. Thus, all arguments advanced above in regard to claim 1 are hereby incorporated so as to apply to claim 53. Thus, claim 53 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Independent claims 22 and 48 have been amended to depend from claims 1 and 27, respectively. Thus, claims 22 and 48 incorporate the limitations of their respective base claims and are allowable for at least the reasons described above, in addition to the further patentable limitations recited therein.

The Examiner only applied Ryan in view of various combinations of other references including Knight, Dumais, Logan, and Zhou for the dependent limitations in the claims. Zhou does not remedy the deficiencies of the cited references discussed above. Applicants submit that the dependent claims incorporate the limitations of their respective base claims and are allowable for at least the reasons described above, in addition to the further patentable limitations recited therein.

Conclusion

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims now pending are patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons given above. Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections of these claims and request allowance of them.

If the Examiner believes that for any reason direct contact with Applicants' attorney would help advance the prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: __April 7, 2009__

By: /Brian Hoffman/
Brian M. Hoffman, Attorney of Record
Registration No. 39,713
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (415) 875-2484
Fax: (650) 938-5200
Email: bhoffman@fenwick.com